

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-9 were pending in the application, of which Claim 1 is independent. In the Office Action dated December 28, 2005, Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1-9 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action dated December 28, 2005, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,563,503 ("*Comair*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,563,503 ("*Cragun*"). Claim 1 has been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment overcomes this rejection and adds no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "the timing properties comprising a current time property configured to provide a current local time to a timeline for the animation object and a parent time line property configured to designate a timeline that is the timing parent of the animation object's timeline." Support for this amendment can be found at least in the specification on page 25, line 30 through page 26, line 9.

In contrast, *Comair* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation. For example, *Comair* merely discloses a cat entity 60 that transitions between various states (e.g., asleep state 199a, wake state 199b, play state 199c, hunt state 199d, eat

state 199e, and a die state 199F) based on various external stimuli (e.g., the passage of time, whether or not the cat 60 is able to catch a mouse 62, etc.) (see col. 10, lines 20-25). In *Comair*, timing properties comprising a current time property and a parent time line property are not disclosed.

Furthermore, *Cragun* does not overcome *Comair*'s deficiencies. *Cragun* merely discloses an animated graphical object notification system. For example, *Cragun* discloses a graphical illustration of an animated behavior configuration dialog 500. (See col. 8. lines 12-13.) Animated behavior configuration dialog 500 may be selected by selecting a behavior tab 502. (See col. 8. lines 13-15.) Animated behavior configuration dialog 500 may be adapted to associate animated object behavior attributes such as speed, movement, and the like, to the animated graphical objects. (See col. 8. lines 15-18.) Animated behavior configuration dialog 500 may also be adapted to configure behavior attributes such as location on the display screen, cloning (i.e., multiplying), and the like. (See col. 8. lines 18-22.) In *Cragun*, animated behavior configuration dialog 500 may be adapted to configure a starting animation speed between a plurality of settings such as slow, medium, fast, and the like by making a selection from a speed start menu 504. (See col. 8. lines 22-26.) Also in *Cragun*, the speed of animation may be changed over time by further selecting a menu item from an ending speed menu 512. (See col. 8. lines 26-29.) The speed in *Cragun* may be set to increase, decrease, remain constant, or be bound to some other event or program. (See col. 8. lines 29-31.) For example, a user in *Cragun* may set a meeting reminder animated graphical object to start one hour before the meeting with a slower animation and as the meeting time approaches (e.g., the deadline time) the speed of the

animation increases. (See col. 8. lines 31-34.) Like *Comair*, *Cragun* at least does not teach or suggest timing properties comprising a current time property and a parent time line property.

Combining *Comair* with *Cragun* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Comair* and *Cragun*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "the timing properties comprising a current time property configured to provide a current local time to a timeline for the animation object and a parent time line property configured to designate a timeline that is the timing parent of the animation object's timeline," as recited by amended Claim 1. Accordingly, independent Claim 1 patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 2-9 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claim 1, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-9.

II. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment After Final be entered by the Examiner, placing the claims in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed amendments of the claims do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the

claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that the entry of the Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicant[s] therefore request[s] the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.


In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as amended, are patentable over the cited references. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Official Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Official Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this amendment and
charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 21, 2006

By: _____


Dr. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

Merchant & Gould
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-9946
Telephone: 404.954.5066



DKS:mdb